

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, 9-19, 24-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 37-47, and 52-60 are pending, with claims 1, 7, 29, and 35 being independent. Claims 1, 7, 9, 29, 35, and 37 have been amended and claims 6, 8, 28, 34, 36, and 61-78 have been cancelled by this reply.

This reply is being filed in response to the Final Office Action that was mailed on March 12, 2003, and to the Advisory Action that was mailed on September 3, 2003, which has an appeal that is currently pending. The Final Office Action raised several new issues that may preclude adequate consideration of the appeal on the merits. This reply attempts to resolve those issues, or at least frame them in furtherance of the appeal.

As will be described, the claim amendments presented by this reply are formal, primarily addressing issues raised in the Final Office Action. In particular, independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 8, dependent claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form, independent claim 29 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 36, and dependent claim 35 has been rewritten in independent form. Consequently, they are believed to raise no new issues.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Moody / Okada Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, 9-19, 24-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 37-47, and 52-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,533) in view of Okada (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,029). For the reasons set forth below, the reversal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7, 9-19, 24-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 37-47, and 52-60 is requested.

In claim 1, a set of user interface controls, including a toolbar, is provided to a user. The set of user interface controls provided depends in turn upon a grouping associated with the user. The grouping to be associated with the user is chosen from among multiple possible groupings based upon the user's maturity level. The user's maturity level is determined by accessing a database and accessing the maturity level based on the user identity associated with the user. Claim 1 recites that, in providing the set of user interface controls, an existing collection of user interface controls is changed by removing a user interface control.

Moody fails to disclose changing an existing collection of controls by removing a user interface control to the existing collection of user interface controls, as acknowledged by the Office Action, which turns to Okada for such disclosure. See Final Office Action at pages 2-3. Applicants submit that Okada is similarly deficient.

Okada merely converts the presentation format for several elements of a user interface, without adding or removing elements from the user interface. In one example, Okada converts a picture interface provided by an application program to a new picture interface so as to trigger a change in the picture provided by the application program. Col. 1, ll. 5-17; abstract. In a second example, Okada teaches adding sound effects for a juvenile user. Col. 10, ll. 21-26. In each example, user interface elements are neither added nor removed from the user interface. Rather, their presentation format is changed visually or audibly. By merely changing the presentation format of the user interface element originally presented in the user interface, Okada fails to change an existing collection of user interface controls by removing a user interface control to the existing collection of user interface controls as recited in claim 1. No functionality is removed by Okada. Instead, Okada extracts picture information from an existing application and performs a conversion for the information at a designated target point. Moreover, because Okada fails to remove a user interface control, Okada does not effect a child-friendly user interface.

Thus Moody and Okada, either alone or in combination, do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 1.

For the purposes of this rejection, independent claim 29 recites elements consistent with those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request the reversal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 29. Similarly, Applicants request the reversal of the rejection of dependent claims 2, 4-5, 9-19, 24-27, 30, 32-33, 37-47, and 52-60 which depend therefrom.

In claim 7, a set of user interface controls, including a toolbar, is provided to a user. The set of user interface controls provided depends in turn upon a grouping associated with the user. The grouping to be associated with the user is chosen from among multiple possible groupings based upon the user's maturity level. The user's maturity level is determined by accessing a

database and accessing the maturity level based on the user identity associated with the user.

Claim 7 recites that, in providing the set of user interface controls, an existing collection of user interface controls is changed by adding a user interface control.

Moody fails to disclose changing an existing collection of controls by adding a user interface control to the existing collection of user interface controls, as acknowledged by the Office Action, which turns to Okada for such disclosure. See Final Office Action at pages 2-3. Applicants submit that Okada is similarly deficient.

Okada merely converts the presentation format for several elements of a user interface, without adding or removing elements from the user interface. In one example, Okada converts a picture interface provided by an application program to a new picture interface so as to trigger a change in the picture provided by the application program. Col. 1, ll. 5-17; abstract. In a second example, Okada teaches adding sound effects for a juvenile user. Col. 10, ll. 21-26. In each example, user interface elements are neither added nor removed from the user interface. Rather, their presentation format is changed visually or audibly. By merely changing the presentation format of the user interface element originally presented in the user interface, Okada fails to change an existing collection of user interface controls by adding a user interface control to the existing collection of user interface controls as recited in claim 1. No functionality is added by Okada. Instead, Okada extracts picture information from an existing application and performs a conversion for the information at a designated target point. Moreover, because Okada fails to add a user interface control, Okada does not effect a child-friendly user interface.

Thus Moody and Okada, either alone or in combination, do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 7.

For the purposes of this rejection, independent claim 35 recites elements consistent with those of claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants request the reversal of the rejection of independent claims 7 and 35.

Applicant : Jack WASSOM et al.
Serial No. : 09/224,211
Filed : December 30, 1998
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-033001 / Personalization
02

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Moody Rejection

Claim 61-78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody.
This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 61-78.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. However, please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

September 11, 2003



Scott R. Boalick
Reg. No. 42,337

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331